

### **REMARKS**

This paper responds to the Notice of Non-Responsive Amendment mailed February 28, 2006 and the Office Action mailed on November 7, 2005. Claims 1-14 and 37-42 are now pending in this application.

#### **Examiner Interview Summary**

Applicant would like to thank Examiner Robert J. Popovics for the courtesy extended during the telephonic interview on 3 January 2006 with Applicant's representative. Mr. Peret contacted the Examiner regarding the Requirement for Information mailed on November 7, 2005. Mr Peret stated that Figure One was a representative "generic system" that he and the Inventor had drawn. He stated that there was no particular prior art upon which the Figure was based, either in whole or in part. Regarding the particulars pertaining to the "depth of the bed," "densities of the beads," and "diameters of the beads," Mr. Peret indicated that these were interdependent results effective variables, determined by those skilled in the art, based on factors, such as, target contaminant, size of tank and other respective variables, less the one begin determined. Mr. Peret indicated that he would ask Mr. Timmons if there were any publications of the type set forth in paragraph number two of the Requirement for Information. Mr. Peret indicated that he would be filing a response for official consideration. No exhibits were presented, and no agreement was reached.

The above account is believed to be a complete and accurate summary of the interview as required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.133. If the Examiner believes that this summary is inaccurate or incomplete, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner point out any deficiencies in his next communication so that Applicant can amend or supplement the interview summary.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

#### **37 CFR §1.105 Requirement for Information**

Applicant and the assignee of this application are required under 37 CFR 1.105 to provide the following information that the examiner had determined is reasonably necessary to the examination of this application.

The Examiner states at page 2 of the Office Action that the Applicant should “provide copies of each publication which any of the applicants authored or co-authored and which describe the disclosed subject matter of **filtration systems employing or mentioning microbeads.**” In response to this requirement, Applicant is submitting two documents for the Examiner’s consideration that were at least partially authored by the inventor and relate to microbead filtering.

The Examiner further states at page 2 of the Office Action that the Applicant should “provide the title, citation and copy of each publication that is a source used for the description of the prior art in the disclosure.” Applicant notes that FIG. 1 was not provided from any particular publication and is meant to illustrate a general schematic drawing of an example prior art water recirculation system.

The Examiner further states at page 2 of the Office Action that “Applicant is required to disclose **the depth of the bed** in the system depicted in Figure 1 and described as ‘prior art’.” Applicant again notes that the system depicted in Figure 1 is a general schematic view. The depth of the bed illustrated in Figure 1 will depend in part on (i) the diameter of the beads; (ii) the density of the beads; (iii) the size of the chamber; (iv) the number of beads; and (v) the desired type of filtration (among other factors).

The Examiner further states at page 2 of the Office Action that “Applicant is required to disclose **the diameters of the beads** in the system depicted in Figure 1 and described as ‘prior art’.” Applicant notes that the diameters of the beads illustrated in Figure 1 will depend in part on (i) the depth of the bed; (ii) the density of the beads; (iii) the size of the chamber; (iv) the number of beads; and (v) the desired type of filtration (among other factors).

The Examiner further states at page 2 of the Office Action that “Applicant is required to disclose **the density of the beads** in the system depicted in Figure 1 and described as ‘prior art’.” Applicant notes that the density of the beads illustrated in Figure 1 will also depend in part on (i) the depth of the bed; (ii) the diameter of the beads; (iii) the size of the chamber; (iv) the number of beads; and (v) the desired type of filtration (among other factors).

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (262) 646-6000 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL B. TIMMONS

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
(612) 373-6972

Date 3/16/06

By Andrew R. Peret  
Andrew R. Peret  
Reg. No. 41,246

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 16th day of March, 2006.

Name

Signature